UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/509,286 | 09/23/2004 | Wolfgang Keil | 2002P05160WOUS | 3698 | |
| 29177 RELL BOYD | 7590 01/29/2008 & LLOYD LLP | EXAMINER | | | |
| BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP P.O. BOX 1135 | | | LI, GU/ | LI, GUANG W | |
| CHICAGO, IL 60690 | | • | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2146 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE. | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 01/29/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/509,286 | KEIL, WOLFGANG | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Guang Li . | 2146 | | |

| Peters the Filing of an Annual Drief | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| 3334 | Guang Li . | 2146 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| HE REPLY FILED <u>01/03/2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | - | in the final rejection, wh | ichever is later. In | | | | |
| The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da). | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offite of the final rejection, | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed, | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | o avoid dismissal of th | ns of the date of ne appeal. Since | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | warm the time period bet forth in t | ,, o | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | | jected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ampliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s | | ,p., | (| | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | will not be entered, or b) will will will be w | ill be entered and an | explanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | • | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| 3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | nd sufficient reasons why the affida | vit or other evidence i | s necessary and | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S | eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(| ils to provide a 1). | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control of the contr | · | | | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered be see Continues Sheet. | | in condition for allowa | nce because: | | | | |
| 2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | | | | |
| 13. | | MAT | lu | | | | |
| | SI | JEFFREY | | | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

- A) The amended claim 21 add the limitation "the updder limites for the number of logically address
- B) An Edge router is not an AAA server and there is no dislosure in Salama to suggest the edge router includes an AAA server
- C) Regulary sending an updated message between AAA servers
- D) estimate a number of logical address issuable by first AAA server
- E) product of maximum rate at which AAA server can process requests different than Prior Art Salama discloses

Response to A, examiner disagree with applicant's argument A. applicant address out the new limitiation change the ground of rejection need further research

Response to B, examiner disagree with applicant's argument B. An edge router can be perforned AAA server becaucse operforming the same function as the AAA server. The only different is it control the local address pools instead of AAA server control the Global IP address

Response to C, examiner disagree with applicant's argument C. Regular sending an update message between the AAA server to the Edge router (A global Ip address pool 400 is maintained in AAA server 405 and the Edge routers 410 and 415 communcatie with AAA server via AAA proxies 420 and 425 for update the Global address) see col.7 lines 21-26 and global IP Address pool 600 is maintained in DHCP server 605 see col.7 lines 54-57.

Response to D, examiner disagree with applicant's argument D. In the prior art, col.8 lines 64-67, Salama discloses local Ip address monitor 840 local Ip address pool utilization us determining how many IP address been assigned and whethere exess the high water mark level.

Response to E, examiner disagree with applicant's argument E. In the prior art, col. 4 lines 15-24 dislose on-demand management of internet protocol (IP) address pool includes an allocator an an unused uo addrss from a local IP address pool desgined for remote domain. Salama disclose the limitation "forming the product of maximum rate at which AA server can pprocess requests" by reuse the unused IP address from a local Ip address pool for maximum rate using the address pool address.

JEFFREY PWU SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER